10F4	TN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT PROFESSION
	FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARY/AND LOGGED
	DEC 04 2019
,	AT EALTIMORE COURT
	Plaintiff Plaintiff
	Civil Action No: (718-19-33)2
	A181 Mobility Services, LLC
	Defendant
	Motion for Reconsideration
	Persuant to FEd. R. CiUP 59(e)
•	
	On November 18,2019, Self-represented plaintiff
	Alfred Musa Filed the above-captioned complaint
	against Defendant AT8 T mobility services, 1 LC.
	On November 26,2019 This court issued an
	order dismissing Musa's Complaint by Construing
	and instituting it as a 42 U.S. C\$1983 action
	against AT&T.
	After this court construed and instituted
•	Musa's complaint as a 42 U.S. C. 8 1983 action against
,	ATIT, this court's reasoning For dismissing Musa's
	complaint is that 1) AT&T is not a state Actor
,	nor does it have a sufficiently close relationship
	with a State actor, 2) Even if AToT was a state
	actor musa's claim is precluded by the
	Rooker-Feldman doctrone

2054	
	Musa Now Humbly Asks this Honorable
	court to reconsider it's order and reinstate
	his Action Against ("AT&T") to proceed on the
	court to reconsider it's order and reinstate his Action Against ("AT&T") to proceed on the basis That, I) This court "ERRED" by construing
	and instituting his complaint as a 42 (1.5. C. 8 1983
•	Action against AT&T, 2) Had this court Not
	FBBFD", Musa's complaint would not be precluded
	by the Rooker-Feldman doctrin.
	M
<u> </u>	Musa's position is that inorder for this court
	to construe and institute his complaint as a
13_	42 U.S. C\$ 1983 action Against AT&T. Musa would have to Allege" 1) That AT&T ("which is a private company")
	Allege 1) that AT& (Which is a private company)
	conspired with state of ficials to deprive him of
	his constitutional rights,
	2) Musa would have to Allege that AT&T coas taking
	orders From State officials to provide Palse information.
	3) Musa would have to allege that AT&T had knowledge that state officials Altered and Manipulated it's Network's call and cell location data and allowed it to go uncorrected because of any relationship it had with state officials.
	manin la la latte met pack's call and call lacation
	data and allowed it to on uncorrected because
	of any relationship it had with state officials
	ary carronsing production states
	Musa's complaint does not contain any of these
	3 Allegations, wor does musa's complaint
	gives any indication or impression that he is
	asserting that AT&T was or is a state Actor,

30F4	
	or helped State officials in Framing Musa' and 'Defrauding This Court'.
	and "Defrauding This Court"
	Instead, Musa's complaint is centered on
	1) AT&T'S Negligence of not protecting their
	wetwork's call and cell location data From bein
	Altered and manipulated.
	2) AT&T's "LACK of knowledge" of their wetwork's
	Kall and cell Location data being compromised
	by State officials.
	3) AT& T's Negligence in not Analyzing it's call and
	cell Location data before providing phone records
	to Musa's Attorney or Federal prosecutors
	which would have enabled them to detect
	and realize their Network's data has been
	Altered and manipulated, and comproMised
	4) AT&T's negligent misrepresentation that phone
	records provided were true and accurate
	T. n. (- 0) - 1 10
	In Musa's Complaint, their is indication and the impression and Allegation that, 1) AT&T did not
	The impression and Allegation That, WAISI aid not
	have knowledge that the phone records provided
	have knowledge that the phone records provided to Musa's attorney or Federal prosecutors were False, and the date in their Network's
	data were Altered, manipulated and compromised
	by State officials.
,	by sinc or i cia

4 0)	
4084	M
	Musa's complaint is a clear case of Negligence
	Musa's complaint is a clear case of Negligence and Negligent Misrepresentation by AT&T')
	Which holds Them hiable For damages caused
·	to musa, which could and should proceed under
	The Authority of 28 U.S. C\$ 1331 and 28 U.S. C\$ 1332
	Musa's Complaint Against ATET was not an
	Musa's complaint Against AT&T was not an action under 42 U.S. C§ 1983 and He has Clairified
	his position in this motion for Reconsideration.
	Therefore Musa Humbly, and Respectfully Asks
	this Honorable court to reconsider it's order
	made on november 26,2019, and Reinstate His
	Complaint Against AT&T and allow His complaint
	to proceed.
	Alfred Musa #3400292 Alfred Muse November 30,2019
2	40/ E Madison st
	Baltimore Md 21202

	Case 1:19-cv-03312-GLR Document 4 Filed 12/04/19 Page 5 RECEIVED
	J. DEC 0 4 2019
,	\sim
	Dear Court clerk please file This Thorno DEPUTY For Reconsideration under civil Action 19-33/2
	For Reconsideration under civil Action 19-33/2
	Thank you very Much.
	Alfred Musa #3400292 November 30, 2019
	401 E-madison St
	baltimore md 21202